

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of the outstanding rejection and allowance of the subject application are respectfully solicited in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 22 through 45 are pending, with Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37 being independent. Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, 37, and 40-45 have been amended.

Claims 22 through 45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the patent to Strandwitz, et al. (U.S. Patent 6,522,352 B1) in view of the patent to Davis (U.S. Patent 6,078,350 A).

In response, while not conceding the propriety of the rejection, independent Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37 have been amended. Applicants respectfully submit that as amended, Claims 22, 25, 28, 31, 34, and 37 are allowable over the patents to Strandwitz, et al. and Davis at least for the following reasons.

Independent Claim 22 relates to a communication system comprising a first apparatus in a wireless network, a second apparatus in a wired network, and a communication apparatus that is arranged to communicate with the first apparatus and is arranged to communicate with the second apparatus and includes encoding and decoding units.

Claim 22 has been amended to recite that the communication apparatus includes a wireless communication unit and a wired communication unit. Claim 22 has also been amended to recite that the wireless communication unit is adapted to receive first encoded video data encoded by a first video encoding system and transmitted from the first apparatus. Claim 22 has been further amended to recite that the decoding unit is adapted to

decode the first encoded video data received by the wireless communication unit to provide decoded video data. In addition, Claim 22 has been amended to recite that the encoding unit is adapted to encode the decoded video data from the decoding unit into second encoded video data using a second video encoding system. Finally, Claim 22 has been amended to recite that the wired communication unit is adapted to transmit the second encoded video data to the second apparatus.

In contrast, neither the Strandwitz, et al. patent, nor the Davis patent is understood to disclose or suggest a decoding unit adapted to decode first encoded video data received by a wireless communication unit to provide decoded video data, as recited by amended Claim 22. In addition, these patents are not understood to disclose or suggest that a wireless communication unit is adapted to receive first encoded video data encoded by a first video encoding system and transmitted from a first apparatus in a wireless network, as also recited by amended Claim 22.

Rather, the Strandwitz patent is merely understood to disclose an encoding/decoding module 200 of a processor 110 that receives a signal from a camera 130 apparently through a wired connection and transmits a signal to a monitor 140 apparently through a wired connection, as shown in Figure 2. And, the Davis patent is merely understood to show decoders 212 and 222 to decode video data received from a wired network, and encoders 214 and 224 to encode video data to supply it to a wired network.

Sine neither of these patents is understood to disclose or suggest a decoding unit adapted to decode the first encoded video data received by the wireless communication unit to provide decoded video data, or that a wireless communication unit is adapted to receive first encoded video data encoded by a first video encoding system and transmitted from a

first apparatus in a wireless network, as also recited by amended Claim 22, a prima facie case of obviousness has not yet been established against Claim 22, since MPEP § 2142 requires the cited art to disclose or suggest all the claimed features to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 22 be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed. And since independent apparatus Claim 25 has been amended in the same way, and since Claim 28 is a corresponding method that has been amended in a corresponding way, these claims are allowable for the same or corresponding reasons.

Amended Claim 31 relates to a communication system comprising a first apparatus in a wireless network, a second apparatus in a wired network, and a communication apparatus that is arranged to communicate with the first apparatus and is arranged to communicate with the second apparatus. The communication apparatus includes a wireless communication unit, a decoding unit, an encoding unit, and a wired communication unit. The wired communication unit is adapted to receive second encoded video data encoded by a second video encoding system and transmitted from the second apparatus. The decoding unit is adapted to decode the second encoded video data received by the wired communication unit to provide decoded video data. The encoding unit is adapted to encode the decoded video data from the decoding unit into first encoded video data using a first video encoding system. The wireless communication unit is adapted to transmit the first encoded video data to the first apparatus.

In contrast, neither the Strandwitz, et al. patent, nor the Davis patent is understood to disclose or suggest a decoding unit adapted to decode second encoded video data

received by a wired communication unit to provide decoded video data, an encoding unit adapted to encode the decoded video data from the decoding unit into first encoded video data using a first video encoding system, and a wireless communication unit adapted to transmit the first encoded video data to the first apparatus in a wireless network, as recited by amended Claim 31.

Sine neither of these patents is understood to disclose or suggest the decoding, encoding, and wireless communication units recited by amended Claim 31, a prima facie case of obviousness has not yet been established against Claim 31, since MPEP § 2142 requires the cited art to disclose or suggest all the claimed features to establish a prima facie case of obviousness.


For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 31 be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed. And since independent apparatus Claim 34 has been amended in the same way, and since Claim 37 is a corresponding method that has been amended in a corresponding way, these claims are allowable for the same or corresponding reasons.

The dependent claims are also submitted to be patentable because they set forth additional aspects of the present invention and are dependent from independent claims discussed above. Therefore, separate and individual consideration of each dependent claim is respectfully requested.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application is in condition for allowance, and therefore, the issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C., office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our address below.

Respectfully submitted,



Attorney for Applicants  
Gary M. Jacobs  
Registration No. 28,861

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3800  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

DSG/GMJ:ayr

DC\_MAIN 219074v1